



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,743	12/21/2001	Seppo Pyhalammi	4208-4023	6150

7590

07/16/2003

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

10/029,743

Applicant(s)

PYHALAMMI ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,4 . 6) ☐ Other: .

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. US patent 6,591,288 and further in view of McLain US patent 6,493,758.

As per claim 1, Edwards teaches a method for a wireless terminal to browse content, comprising:

monitoring browsing activity of a user and storing browsed content in a personal network cache [fig.3 steps 67, 68, col.5 lines 19-22];

analyzing said browsed content to determine frequently visited content [col.6 lines 1-11, col.7 lines 24-25];

Edwards does not teach transmitting the frequent visited content to a local cache on the terminal. In a similar field of invention, McLain teaches providing a local cache on a mobile device to enable offline browsing [see abstract, col.3 lines 40-

Art Unit: 2153

49]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of McLain with Edwards because it would have enable the wireless terminal to have access to frequent visited content while offline and to reduce connection cost.

As per claim 2, McLain teaches user selected content [col. 3 lines 43-44].

As per claim 3, Edwards teaches identifies related content [col.5 lines 26-35]. It would have been obvious in the system as modified to download related content to the local cache because it would have enabled the user to browse related content offline.

As per claim 4, Edwards teaches extracting from personal caches of other wireless terminal users [col.6 lines 49-55].

As per claims 5 and 7, Edwards does not teach highlighting frequent visited content and changed portions. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so because it would have enabled the user to visually know the status of the contents.

As per claim 6, the references do not specifically teach user specified update frequency. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so because it would have improved the system by enabling the user to customize to the system to update contents according to his preference.

As per claim 8, the references do not specifically teach update at a time the network is less utilized. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to update content at non-peak time because it would have reduced cost and congestion of the network.

As per claim 9, Edwards teaches deleting content that not qualified as frequently visited [col.7 lines 20-23].

As per claim 10, McLain teaches formatting content for presentation of the wireless terminal [abstract, col.3 lines 55-60]. It is apparent that content that can not be displayed on the terminal are deleted. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so because it would have freed the cache storage space for other contents.

As per claim 11, Edwards teaches retrieving the latest version of the content from the network [fig.3 step 56, 58, 59].

As per claim 12, McLain teaches class of delivery [channel].

As per claim 13, McLain teaches network capacity, usage and size of the contents [col.3 lines 40-64].

As per claim 14, Edwards teaches user profile indicating frequently visited content [col.7 lines 24-26].

As per claim 15, Edwards teaches the frequent contents are web pages [col.5 lines 26-35].

Claims 16-20 and 21-24 are system corresponding to the method of claims 1-15. They are rejected under similar rationales as for claims 1-15 above.

As per claim 25, Edwards teaches a mobile browsing booster system comprising:

a layer 7 switch [fig.2 14, 20] equipped with a web proxy [14] for monitoring data network based browsing activity of a wireless terminal user [see fig.3];

a data base for storing content browsed by the user [fig.2 28];

a browsing agent [26] for analyzing content stored in network cache to determine frequently visited content [fig.4].

Edwards does not teach transmitting the frequent visited content to a local cache on the terminal for browsing without establishing a network connection. In a similar field of invention, McLain teaches providing a local cache on a mobile device to enable offline browsing [see abstract, col.3 lines 40-49]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of McLain with Edwards because it would have enable the wireless terminal to have access to frequent visited content while offline and to reduce connection cost.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 26, McLain teaches analyzing content according type specified by the user [col. 3 lines 43-44].

As per claim 27, the reference does not specifically teaches schedule delivery. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to schedule transferring update content to the terminal because it would have made efficient use of the wireless network to reduced cost and congestion.

As per claim 28, the reference does not specifically disclose comparing identifier to selectively monitoring a user's browsing session. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to selectively monitor browsing session because it would have improved the privacy of the users of system to enable the user to choose to have his browsing session monitored.

As per claims 29-31, Edwards teaches sending the latest versions of contents from the web proxy [fig.3 56, 54, 52].

As per claims 32-33, Edwards teaches plural of personal network caches [col.7 lines 24-26].

As per claim 34, McLain teaches formatting content for presentation of the wireless terminal [col.3 lines 55-60].

As per claims 35-36, Edwards does not teach highlighting frequent visited content and changed portions. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so because it

Art Unit: 2153

would have enabled the user to visually know the status of the contents.

As per claim 29, the frequently visited and related contents are stored in the network cache prior to transmission to the terminal [col.6 lines 54-60].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)
(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).



Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
July 11, 2003